

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

**STATUS OF APPLICATION**

Claims 1-5, 7-12, and 14-23 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11 and 19 were amended. Claims 21-23 were added. Support for the amended and new claims can be found in the specification, specifically paragraphs [26]-[27] and Fig. 4. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,847,704 to Hollister A. Hartman ("Hartman") in view of U.S. Patent 5,801,667 to Shimizu et al. ("Shimizu").

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in light of the amendments to the claims and following remarks.

**THE CLAIMS**

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references, individually or in combination, make obvious each and every feature of the present invention as claimed. For example, claim 1 recites, in part, "... wherein a diameter of the first annular structure is larger than a diameter of the second annular structure, ... ." Neither Hartman nor Shimizu discusses first and second annular structures, much less a diameter of the first annular structure compared to the second annular structure.

In addition, claim 1 recites, in part, "... lower speed values appear on the first graphical display portion as the first annular structure appears to revolve in a first direction, and higher speed values appear on the first graphical display portion as the first annular structure appears to revolve in a second direction, lower speed values appear on the second graphical display portion as the second annular structure appears to revolve in the first direction, and higher speed values appear on the second graphical display portion as the second annular structure appears to revolve in the second direction, ... ." Hartman clearly fails to disclose even a first annular structure that appears to revolve about a fixed axis. Meanwhile, Shimizu's alarm display device 5 uses variation of a pattern, color, or the like on a rotation drum 7. Nowhere does Shimizu discuss the direction of appearance of lower or higher speed values as claimed.

Moreover, the cited references, individually and in combination, do not teach that "... the first annular structure and the second annular structure appear to revolve at the same rotational speed" as recited in claim 1. Neither Hartman nor Shimizu discusses first and second annular structures, much less the rotational speed of the first annular structure compared to rotational speed of the second annular structure.

Accordingly, claim 1 should be allowed for at least these reasons.

Independent claims 11 and 19 should be allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for claim 1.


Claims 2-5, 7-10, 12, 14-18, and 20-23 which are dependent claims, should be allowable for at least the same rationale as their independent claims, as well as for the additional features they recite.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Tyrone Y. Brown  
Reg. No. 46,580

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 650-326-2400  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
TYB:tyb  
60270950 v1